UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1996/4
2 January 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 2 JANUARY 1996 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to convey the attached final biannual report addressed to me on 30 December 1995 by the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia.

I should be grateful if you would bring this information to the attention of the members of the Security Council.

(Signed) Boutros BOUTROS-GHALI

96-00143 (E) 040196 050196

/...

Annex

Biannual report of the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee on the activities of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia was established in August 1992, to remain in being until a settlement of the problems of the former Yugoslavia had been achieved. Its seat is at the United Nations Office at Geneva. The Co-Chairmen of the Conference are the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Head of State or Government of the Presidency of the European Union. The activities of the Conference are supervised by a Steering Committee co-chaired by representatives of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Presidency of the European Union. The current Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee are Mr. Carl Bildt (European Union) and Mr. Thorvald Stoltenberg (United Nations). The day-to-day activities of the Conference are carried out by the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee and in working groups and task forces.

2. Pursuant to the decisions adopted at the Peace Implementation Conference (8 and 9 December) (S/1995/1029) and as indicated in the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council (S/1995/1031), the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia will cease to exist as of 31 January 1996.

3. Information on the activities of the Conference from July to December 1995 is provided below.

4. Since the submission, on 26 July 1995, of the previous biannual report (S/1995/626), the International Conference has continued to provide a valuable framework for peacemaking, peace-building and humanitarian and human rights activities in the former Yugoslavia. These have included:

(a) The operation of the International Conference Mission which, since September 1994, has watched over the closure by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) of its border towards areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina controlled by Bosnian Serbs;

(b) Cooperation with the Contact Group countries in the development of a settlement for Bosnia and Herzegovina and the provision of inputs into peace negotiations among the parties to the conflict;

(c) Cooperation with the Contact Group countries in the development of a settlement for the eastern area of Croatia (Eastern Slavonia) and the provision of inputs into talks between the Croatian Government and the Serb local authorities;

(d) Use of the International Conference framework, notably its Humanitarian Issues Working Group, for alerting the international community to pressing humanitarian issues and for humanitarian appeals;

(e) The promotion of dialogue on human rights issues involving ethnic communities, nationalities and minorities in the former Yugoslavia;

(f) The consideration of economic and reconstruction issues.

II. HUMANITARIAN ISSUES

5. The Conference's Working Group on Humanitarian Issues, chaired by Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, has continued its efforts to generate financing for humanitarian activities, to provide protection and assistance for refugees and displaced persons, and to help to uphold international norms on human rights and humanitarian law. Under the auspices of the Working Group, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and other international humanitarian agencies have helped millions of civilians caught up in the conflict, as well as refugees and displaced persons, to survive the winters of 1992, 1993, 1994 and 1995.

6. The period covered by the present report saw a continued and unprecedented influx of refugees and displaced persons, affecting the humanitarian situation and activities. The fall of the eastern enclaves of Srebrenica on 11 July and Zepa on 25 July to the Bosnian Serb forces resulted in the exodus of 36,000 displaced persons to the Tuzla and Zenica regions. UNHCR identified 11,000 persons placed in collective centres around Tuzla. At the Tuzla airbase, UNHCR, in cooperation with the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) and a number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), assisted the new arrivals from Srebrenica. At the end of July, a host family agreement was signed between the Bosnian Government and UNHCR for limited assistance to 4,500 host families in the Tuzla region. On 17 July, the High Commissioner for Refugees travelled to Tuzla to meet the victims from Srebrenica and review the efforts of UNHCR and other humanitarian organizations to assist them.

7. As the fall of Zepa became imminent, the local authorities and UNHCR made preparations to receive a possible influx of new arrivals in the Zenica region. An emergency response committee was formed to coordinate the relief action. UNHCR and UNPROFOR erected a transit camp in Zenica, where the registration of the new arrivals took place and assistance was distributed. Some 4,300 displaced persons were placed in collective centres, which were supplied with basic emergency items, as well as in host families.

8. The capture by Croatian HV/HVO forces of Glamoc and Grahovo in late July, led to the flight of 14,000 Serbs to northern Bosnia. Many of them subsequently made their way to Banja Luka. UNHCR dispatched relief items including food, plastic sheeting and sanitary materials to assist the newly displaced persons.

9. The stocks of aid supplies UNHCR had prepositioned in Banja Luka were quickly exhausted with the mass influx of refugees from the Krajina, and additional quantities of food and non-food emergency supplies were brought in by land from Belgrade. UNHCR made fuel available to assist the refugees with their transportation needs as most gradually moved on towards Serbia. In cooperation with the local authorities, way stations were established along the road to Serbia where aid was distributed. UNHCR established an airlift to Belgrade to

replenish stocks there. In addition, the United Kingdom Government made two helicopters available to UNHCR, to be used to transport relief supplies from Zagreb to Banja Luka. On 12 August, the Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees visited Banja Luka to meet with the local authorities, review the emergency aid operation and visit some of the sites where the new refugees were accommodated. In order to cope with the needs of the many thousands of Serb displaced persons in the Banja Luka area, a number of UNHCR field staff from other offices were temporarily deployed to the Banja Luka office. The work of UNHCR and other aid organizations was hampered by the very poor security situation in the area, with repeated hijackings at gunpoint, harassment and banditry. A letter was addressed to Bosnian Serb leader Rodavan Karadzic protesting in "the most strenuous terms" at the "intolerable acts which have been perpetuated recently". The local Serb authorities pledged their support in preventing such incidents from recurring.

10. A major concern was the situation of the remaining Serb population in the Krajina, most of whom were elderly and frail and lived in remote, isolated villages. Human rights violations, including burning and looting of abandoned property, harassment and brutal violence, were brought to the attention of the Croatian Government at the highest levels on a number of occasions, together with the serious criticisms from the international community. UNHCR, UNCRO, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and the European Community Monitoring Mission (ECMM) identified the most vulnerable among them. The Croatian Red Cross took an active role and deployed six mobile teams to cater for and assist the needy population, with monitoring, funding and other support provided by a number of international organizations, including UNHCR. However, government resources and support for assistance to vulnerable minority cases remained minimal. The local Red Cross branches remained understaffed and with little logistical support to reach the many remote villages. UNHCR vehicle support to the Croatian Red Cross was only part of the solution; some government social welfare offices - independent of the Red Cross system but crucial to the relief work - had no access to transportation and received little or no support from their central offices in Zagreb.

11. UNHCR supported the authorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to cope with the massive influx of Krajina refugees. A UNHCR emergency relief team was deployed in Serbia to assess the needs of the refugees and coordinate the distribution of supplies. UNHCR distributed food and non-food items and fuel, together with emergency assistance. The massive influx of refugees had a substantial impact on UNHCR's assistance programme in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) where the caseload more than doubled. In the supplement to the United Nations revised consolidated inter-agency appeal for the former Yugoslavia issued on 15 September 1995, UNHCR requested an additional US$ 24 million to meet the new requirements in the sectors of transport and logistics, domestic needs and household support, health and nutrition, shelter and community services.

12. The arrival of tens of thousands of Krajina refugees in the Banja Luka region resulted in a dramatic deterioration of the situation for the Croat and Muslim minorities, who felt that the only option left was to leave the region. UNHCR's involvement in the movement - some 22,000 left via the Srbac-Davor

crossing - was limited to predeparture interviews and presence at the crossing points. UNHCR also urged the local authorities to ensure that minority men on work or military obligation were allowed to return to their homes so that families wishing to depart were not separated. UNHCR urged the authorities to meet their responsibility of accommodating all refugees, not only the ones of Croat ethnicity, the Government having linked the admission of Muslim refugees from Banja Luka to UNHCR providing accommodation for them. UNHCR took up the issue of "resettlement" of Bosnian Muslim refugees back to Bosnia and Herzegovina (Bihac) with the Croatian Government on a number of occasions, emphasizing that, as a signatory to the 1951 Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees, Croatia had a duty to keep its doors of asylum open to refugees and that it must not forcibly repatriate those coming in from Bosnia and Herzegovina. UNHCR extended its full support to the Government in providing assistance to the refugees during their stay in Croatia, for example by providing shelter to Bosnian Muslim refugees in the UNCRO bases in Pustara and Novska in Western Slavonia.

13. After the recapture of the Bihac pocket by the Fifth Corps of the Bosnian Army on 7 August, UNHCR established a permanent presence in the Kuplensko camp, where some 20,000 former inhabitants of Velika Kladusa and Cazin loyal to Fidret Abdic arrived and lived in appalling conditions along the roadside. UNHCR, together with other humanitarian agencies, provided food and non-food assistance, shelter, water, sanitation and medical assistance and started a winterization operation to enable the refugees to survive during the cold months. The efforts were hampered by the extremely strict control imposed by the Croatian Special Police at the camp, which initially prevented some vital materials such as gravel and fuel from entering the camp. UNHCR also strongly protested incidents of refoulement in the camp, where male refugees were deported by the Croatian special police in Vojnic and handed over to the Bosnian police in Velika Kladusa.

14. On 30 October, UNHCR started a bus service from the camp to Velika Kladusa to enable those wishing to return home to do so. On arrival in Velika Kladusa, the local authorities have been registering the refugees. The refugees have in most cases returned to their houses, where UNHCR and other international organizations are monitoring their situation. By 15 December, over 4,200 refugees had returned to Velika Kladusa from the Kuplensko camp, using the UNHCR-organized buses or their own means of transport. The UNHCR buses arriving in Velika Kladusa also provided onward travel to Cazin and Vrnograc.

15. Access to Sarajevo was very irregular during the summer months, with only 15 per cent of the target met in June, 30 per cent in July and 45 per cent in August. With the opening of the "blue routes" and the airlift, conditions improved. The humanitarian airlift resumed on 16 September after over five months of suspension. The airlift operation was temporarily suspended from 6 to 30 November to allow for a build-up of stock at Ancona in order to sustain a full schedule. UNHCR and the High-level Working Group agreed that the airbridge will carry whatever stock has been built up at Ancona by 10 December (up to 5,000 tons), before the operation is discontinued early next year.

16. A number of protection issues in Croatia were of great concern to UNHCR. In spite of repeated requests from the international community, including UNHCR,

the Croatian Government did not establish a mechanism to enable those Krajina Serbs wishing to return to Croatia to do so. The law on abandoned property in the Krajina, which represented a serious impediment to possible large-scale return, was not re-examined by the Croatian Parliament. The Office for Displaced Persons and Refugees started to depopulate some refugee centres, particularly in the Istria region, with the purpose of closing them down. Some of the Bosnian Croat refugees from these centres were resettled in former Sectors North and South and others had the possibility of going elsewhere in Croatia. However, Bosnian Muslim refugees who opted to remain in Croatia often faced increased hardship conditions.

17. UNHCR, in coordination with ICRC, followed closely the situation of the estimated 800 Moslems from Zepa and Srebrenica who were detained at Mitrovo Polje and Slivovica in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). In order to prevent any possible attempt to refoule them to Bosnia and Herzegovina, UNHCR requested the authorities to consider them as refugees and therefore under UNHCR protection. UNHCR expressed its complete availability to assist them in submitting their applications for resettlement to third countries and sent 10 resettlement case workers to conduct interviews with the group. At the time of finalizing the present report, the first group had departed, without major problems and in cooperation with relevant authorities.

18. With the recent peace agreement and new territorial configuration in Bosnia and Herzegovina, several resettlement cases were put on hold, who, according to the new territorial agreement would be able to return to their places of origin. At this time consideration is given to refugees from Banja Luka and some refugees in marriages of mixed ethnicity.

19. UNHCR issued a strong statement concerning the involuntary relocation by the Bosnian authorities of displaced persons to newly acquired areas. UNHCR worked on assessment of conditions, particularly the issue of voluntariness, in respect to the planned return of 1,000 persons to Sanski Most and Kljuc. Repeated visits were paid to Jajce, Travnik and Bugojno to monitor the progress in the return of Bosniac and Croat families, which met with difficulties with some Croat families returning to Bugojno and Travnik, but no Muslims being allowed to go back to Jajce and Stolac.

20. Faced with the dramatic escalation of the humanitarian needs in the former Yugoslavia, a supplement to the revised inter-agency appeal for the former Yugoslavia of 31 May 1995 was issued on 15 September to respond to the considerable rise in internally displaced persons and refugees following events since May 1995. The revised inter-agency target was increased from US$ 470 million by US$ 44.8 million to a total of US$ 514.8 million. The UNHCR component of US$ 206.4 million was increased to US$ 222.7 million in December.

21. A new United Nations consolidated inter-agency appeal for the former Yugoslavia was launched on 20 November, for US$ 179.6 million to fund humanitarian assistance to 3.3 million beneficiaries in the former Yugoslavia from January to April 1996. The UNHCR component is US$ 70.9 million.

22. The Humanitarian Issues Working Group of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia met in Geneva on 19 July and on 10 October, under the

chairmanship of the High Commissioner for Refugees. At the London Implementation Conference, the High Commissioner for Refugees announced that the Working Group would meet on 16 January 1996, in view of the urgency of the tasks involved in repatriation planning.

23. The High Commissioner for Refugees undertook a mission to Sarajevo, Zagreb and Belgrade, from 4 to 6 December 1995 and held meetings with the respective Presidents and government officials to discuss the implementation of the Dayton peace agreement.

III. PEACEMAKING

24. In June 1995, following the appointment of Mr. Carl Bildt as the new European Union Co-Chairman of the Steering Committee, the Co-Chairmen undertook a review of forthcoming activities and decided that, in order to give enhanced focus to their efforts, one would spearhead peacemaking efforts concerning Bosnia and Herzegovina while the other would spearhead peacemaking efforts concerning Croatia, it being understood that they would be jointly responsible for all activities of the Conference. Pursuant to this arrangement, Carl Bildt, the European Union Co-Chairman, focused on peacemaking in Bosnia and Herzegovina, while Thorvald Stoltenberg, the United Nations Co-Chairman, focused on peacemaking in the Republic of Croatia.

A. Peacemaking in Bosnia and Herzegovina

25. Between June and October 1995, Mr. Bildt worked intensively with representatives of the Contact Group countries to promote a negotiated solution to the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. On 8 September 1995, in Geneva, he jointly chaired talks among Bosnian leaders at which a set of principles for a settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina was agreed upon. On 26 September 1995, in New York, he jointly chaired another meeting of Bosnian leaders at which a set of further principles was agreed upon.

26. From 1 to 21 November 1995, Mr. Bildt jointly chaired the proximity peace talks held in Dayton, Ohio. On 21 November 1995, a General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina together with 11 annexes and related documents were initialled. These documents were subsequently signed in Paris on 14 December 1995 (see S/1995/999, attachment).

B. Peacemaking in Croatia

27. Between July and September 1995, the United Nations Co-Chairman of the Steering Committee, Mr. Stoltenberg, was engaged in prolonged, discreet contacts to promote a peaceful, negotiated solution regarding Eastern Slavonia. On 3 October, in pursuance of his efforts, Mr. Stoltenberg, along with the Ambassador of the United States of America to the Republic of Croatia, Mr. Peter Galbraith, jointly chaired a meeting of representatives of the Government of Croatia and of the Serb local authorities in Sector East. At that meeting, agreement was reached on a set of guiding principles for future

negotiations. The efforts of the Co-Chairmen continued during October and November and culminated with the signing, on 12 November, of a Basic Agreement on the Region of Eastern Slavonia, Baranja, and Western Sirmium (S/1995/951).

IV. THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA MISSION TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA (SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO)

28. The International Conference Mission to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) was established on 17 September 1994, at the invitation of that Government, after the latter had made the following decisions on 4 August 1994:

(a) "To break off political and economic relations with the Republika Srpska";

(b) "To prohibit the stay of the members of the leadership of the Republika Srpska (parliament, presidency and Government) in the territory of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia";

(c) "As of today the border of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is closed for all transport towards the Republika Srpska except food, clothing and medicine."

29. The original members of the International Conference Mission to Yugoslavia arrived in Belgrade on 14 September 1994. The Mission is a civilian mission and is organized and operated correspondingly. Mr. Tauno Nieminen of Finland became the second Head of Mission on 13 January 1995. On 14 December 1995, he was succeeded in that capacity by Mr. Tarmo Kauppila, also of Finland.

30. The mandate of the Mission is to observe the closure of the border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina under control of the Bosnian Serbs in order to verify that only humanitarian aid is allowed to pass. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) retains full control of its borders through its customs, police and military. These officials operate the border crossings. Mission members are present to observe, record and report accordingly.

31. On the basis of an agreement reached with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) authorities, members of the Mission are entitled:

(a) To work with representatives of the Yugoslav Red Cross at places from which humanitarian assistance is organized or dispatched;

(b) To work alongside customs officers;

(c) To look into any vehicle crossing the border;

(d) To have examined any item conveyed by individuals or vehicles crossing the border which they suspect might not be classified as humanitarian aid;

(e) To examine all customs, commercial, transport or related documentation;

(f) To have complete freedom of movement with their safety and security guaranteed by the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro);

(g) To have their own communications system.

32. The Mission works with representatives of international and local humanitarian agencies in carrying out this mandate. Mission teams send daily reports to its headquarters. These reports are compiled weekly and sent to the Co-Chairmen of the Steering Committee. In addition, the Mission produces monthly reports that are also submitted to the Co-Chairmen. On the basis of the information provided by the Mission, the Co-Chairmen report each month to the Security Council through the Secretary-General.

33. The Mission's headquarters are located in Belgrade. The Mission covers the whole border area from the north of Serbia to the south of Montenegro (330 miles, approximately 527 kilometres). Nineteen border control posts are covered on a 24-hour basis. On top of static presence at border control posts, the Mission undertakes mobile day and night patrols along the border, usually in close cooperation with the army or police. The Mission is organized into five field sectors, between two and nine hours' drive from Belgrade and located as follows:

(a) Sector Belgrade. The Sector headquarters is located in Belgrade. This Sector is responsible for observing the loading and customs inspection of goods destined for points beyond the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) border with the Republika Srpska at predesignated loading sites in and around Belgrade, to ensure that only humanitarian aid is forwarded. The Sector's area of responsibility extends west from where the border of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) with Bosnia and Herzegovina meets the Croatian border, to the confluence of the Drina and Sava rivers;

(b) Sector Alpha. The Sector headquarters is located in Banja Koviljaca. This Sector is responsible for the border area from the junction of the Drina and Sava in the north to Drlace in the south;

(c) Sector Bajina Basta. The Sector headquarters is located in Bajina Basta. This Sector is responsible for the border area from Drlace in the north to 3 kms north of Priboj. Sector Bajina Basta is also responsible for the checking and controlling of freight trains on the line passing into and out of "Republika Srpska" territory;

(d) Sector Bravo. The Sector headquarters is located in Priboj. This Sector is responsible for the border area 3 kms north of Priboj to the Tara river in Montenegro;

(e) Sector Charlie. The Sector headquarters is located in Niksic, Montenegro. This Sector is responsible for the border area from the Tara river

in the north to the point at which the border of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) with Bosnia and Herzegovina abuts the border of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) with Croatia, near the Adriatic coast.

34. The Mission's current budget of $4.179 million covers the period from 1 October 1995 to 31 March 1996. This money is spent on operational costs. Some Governments provide vehicles, communications and transmission equipment as well as other assets. In addition, States contributing monitors generally pay the salaries of their personnel. As of 14 December 1995, there were 217 international members of the Mission from 15 countries.

V. ECONOMIC AND RECONSTRUCTION ISSUES

35. The Economic Issues Working Group of the Conference convened on 10 October, with an open agenda. All five delegations attended. They were asked to consider various economic aspects of the peace implementation process, at a time when there were new hopes of a peace agreement being reached. They proceeded to look into the ways that progress made in past meetings of the group, on issues such as the lifting of restrictions on trade and financial transactions or the conditionality that should be attached to economic reconstruction programmes, or the economic aspects of State succession, could be brought to bear on the peace implementation process.

36. Strong emphasis was laid by the Chairman on the integrated nature of most of the infrastructure inherited from the former Yugoslavia, and on the need to promote trade and economic relations among the successor States in order to consolidate peace, when it came, and to ensure the success of the future reconstruction process. The newly independent States of the former Yugoslavia were actively developing economic relations with new partners, but they could not afford to discard economic cooperation between themselves. The Chairman indicated that, in order to ensure the success of reconstruction and to ensure economic recovery, provision would have to be made for cooperation in the fields of trade and infrastructure. A multilateral forum, the Chairman considered, could prove more efficient than a series of bilateral relationships at negotiating appropriate trade and economic agreements in these fields.

VI. ETHNIC AND NATIONAL COMMUNITIES AND MINORITIES

37. During the period covered by the present report, activities have continued under the auspices of the Conference to address issues affecting ethnic and national communities and minorities.

A. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

38. In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Conference's Working Group on Ethnic and National Communities and Minorities has promoted a series of legislative and practical improvements in favour of the Albanians and other nationalities. This followed intensive, patient and detailed talks sponsored by

the Working Group. After the Tetovo incident of 17 February 1995, when one ethnic Albanian was shot, the Working Group succeeded in assembling representatives of all Albanian parties in the Republic, together with the Ministers of the Interior, Justice and Education, around the same table. Since March, 10 rounds of talks have been organized. They were accompanied by numerous individual meetings with representatives of Parliament, other Government agencies, other ethnic groups such as the Turks, opposition figures outside Parliament, and the media.

39. The talks concentrated on new legislation under consideration for all three levels of education and on local self-government. There was also a wide discussion of language issues and of questions pertaining to citizenship and the display of national symbols. Some of this legislation has been adopted in the meantime, taking into consideration various suggestions developed in the Group.

40. In the media sector, the Working Group sponsored an agreement between the Danish and Swiss Governments on the one hand, and "Macedonian Radio and Television" on the other, which provides for the delivery of television equipment for the tripling of emission time in Albanian, and for a considerable increase in languages of other nationalities. A similar radio project has been prepared, within the framework of the Working Group, by specialists from the European Broadcasting Union.

41. In its activities, the Working Group has enjoyed valuable cooperation with the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Mission in Skopje and the Council of Europe.

B. Croatia

42. The Working Group had for some time been trying to set up trilateral talks in Croatia along the model of the talks between the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Albanians in that Republic. Three rounds of talks between the Croatian Government and representatives of Serb organizations in Croatia chaired by the Working Group have taken place. The first two, more general, meetings (12 July 1995 and 31 August 1995) led to an understanding by participants that discussions should focus on concrete issues starting with education. At the third meeting (24 October 1995), which was devoted to educational questions, the Serb representatives identified areas on which they felt some improvements could be made, and it was agreed that they would work out concrete proposals for the next meeting.

C. Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

43. During the reporting period, International Conference personnel have maintained contacts with the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), local authorities and the leaders of the communities involved regarding the situations in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina.